

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/509,578	Applicant(s) YAMADA, KEIJI	
	Examiner NATASHA YOUNG	Art Unit 1797	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NATASHA YOUNG. (3) ED GARLEPP.

(2) WALTER GRIFFIN. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 22 October 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-7.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ohno et al (EP 1142619 A1), US 6,395,370 B1), and background art.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative emphasizes the claimed range of the crisscross portion versus that of Noda et al, emphasizes the differences of claimed invention over background art, and proposes dependent claims to recite more of the structure of the claimed invention.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

--	--